

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – MAIL STOP AF****U.S. Serial No. 09/872,230****Attorney Docket No. 20044/10012****REMARKS**

As an initial matter, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Donovan for the courtesy of the telephone conference call held on January 20, 2004. Accompanying this paper is a paper entitled Interview Summary under 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, which summarizes the substance of the telephonic interview.

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action dated December 15, 2003 and the references it cites. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 4, 11, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 have been amended, and claims 17, 18, 23, and 24 have been canceled. In view of the following, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Before addressing the art rejections, the applicants note that claims 6 and 12-14 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefiniteness rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph in the Office action dated May 20, 2003. In the response to the Office action dated May 20, 2003, the applicants amended claims 6 and 12-14 to overcome the indefiniteness rejections. However, the status of claims 6 and 12-14 are unclear in the Office action dated December 15, 2003. During the telephone conference call held on January 20, 2004, the Examiner verbally indicated to the undersigned that claims 6 and 12-14 are allowable. The indefiniteness rejections noted on pages 2 and 3 of the Office action dated May 20, 2003 should therefore be withdrawn.

Further, the Office actions dated May 20, 2003 and December 15, 2003 allowed claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, claims 21 and 22 are not further discussed herein.

Turning to the art rejections, claims 1-16, 19-22, and 25-28 are pending and at issue in this application. Of the claims at issue, claims 1, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 are independent. In the Office action dated December 15, 2003, claims 1, 26, 27, and 28 were rejected as obvious over one or more of Leyden (U.S. Patent No. 4,455,464) (hereinafter '464 patent), Keifer et

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE – MAIL STOP AF****U.S. Serial No. 09/872,230****Attorney Docket No. 20044/10012**

al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,146,205), Leyden et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,421,667) (hereinafter '667 patent), and Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,570,080). During the telephone conference call held on January 20, 2004, the Examiner verbally indicated to the undersigned that claims 19 and 20 were also rejected as obvious over one or more of the '464 patent, Keifer et al., the '667 patent, and Inoue et al. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 have been amended. The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28, as amended, are patentable over the art cited in the Office action dated December 15, 2003. Independent claims 1, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 specify, *inter alia*, mounting assemblies including a fastener configured to extend through a shroud, a passage of a security sensor, and into a product to secure both the security sensor and the shroud to the product so that the security sensor is captured between the product and the shroud. No such structure is disclosed or suggested in the cited references.

Because none of the cited references discloses or suggests the use of a fastener configured to extend through a shroud, a passage of a security sensor, and into a product to secure both the security sensor and the shroud to the product so that the security sensor is captured between the product and the shroud, it follows that no combination of these references renders the pending claims obvious. Accordingly, the obviousness rejections based thereon should be withdrawn.

JAN-20-2004(TUE) 17:44

P. 011/013

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE - MAIL STOP AF**

**U.S. Serial No. 09/872,230**

**Attorney Docket No. 20044/10012**

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Official action, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/20/04

Frankie Ho

Frankie Ho  
Reg. No. 48,479  
Grossman & Flight, LLC  
20 N. Wacker Dr.  
Suite 4200  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Attorney for Applicants